arXiv:math/0503132v3 [math.QA] 3 May 2005

MULTIPLICITY OF CRITICAL POINTS OF MASTER FUNCTIONS AND SCHUBERT CALCULUS

PRAKASH BELKALE* [1], EVGENY MUKHIN ** [2], AND ALEXANDER VARCHENKO*** [3]

Abstract. In [MV], some correspondences were defined between critical points of master functions associated to sl_{N+1} and subspaces of $\mathbb{C}[x]$ with given ramification properties. In this paper we show that these correspondences are fact scheme theoretic isomorphisms of appropriate schemes. This gives relations between multiplicities of critical point loci of the relevant master functions and multiplicities in Schubert calculus.

* ***Department of Mathematics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3250, USA

** Department of Mathematical Sciences,
Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis,
402 North Blackford St., Indianapolis, IN 46202-3216, USA

Introduction

In [MV], a correspondence between the following objects was shown:

1. Critical points of certain master functions associated to the Lie algebra sl_{N+1};
2. Vector subspaces $V \subset \mathbb{C}[x]$ of rank $N+1$ with prescribed ramification at points of $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Let $l_1, \dots, l_N$ be nonnegative integers and $z_1, \dots, z_n$ distinct complex numbers. For $s = 1, \dots, n$, fix nonnegative integers $m_s(1), \dots, m_s(N)$. Define polynomials $T_1, \dots, T_N$ by the formula $T_i = \prod_{s=1}^n (x - z_s)^{m_s(i)}$. *The master function* Φ *associated to this data* is the rational function

$$\Phi(t_j^{(i)}) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{j=1}^{l_i} T_i(t_j^{(i)})^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^{l_i} \prod_{k=1}^{l_{i+1}} (t_j^{(i)} - t_k^{(i+1)})^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{1 \le j < k \le l_i} (t_j^{(i)} - t_k^{(i)})^2$$

of $l_1 + \cdots + l_N$ variables $t_1^{(1)}, \dots, t_{l_1}^{(1)}, \dots, t_1^{(N)}, \dots, t_{l_N}^{(N)}$ considered on the set of points where

- The numbers $t_1^{(i)}, \dots, t_{l_i}^{(i)}$ are distinct;

---

[1] Supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0300356.
[2] Supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0140460.
[3] Supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0244579.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification* 14N15, 82B23, 17B67.

- The sets $\{t_1^{(i)}, \dots, t_{l_i}^{(i)}\}$ and $\{t_1^{(i+1)}, \dots, t_{l_{i+1}}^{(i+1)}\}$ do not intersect;
- The sets $\{t_1^{(i)}, \dots, t_{l_i}^{(i)}\}$ and $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ do not intersect.

The master functions considered in (1) are functions Φ as above. These functions appear in hypergeometric solutions to the KZ equation. They also appear in the Bethe ansatz method of the Gaudin model, where the goal is to write formulas for singular vectors in a tensor product of representations of sl_{N+1} starting from a critical point. Those Bethe vectors are eigenvectors of certain commuting linear operators called Hamiltonians of the Gaudin model. We refer the reader to [V] for a detailed discussion of these themes.

The set of objects given by (2) are important in the study of linear series on compact Riemann surfaces (see [EH]).

In both of the objects (1), (2) above, there is a natural notion of multiplicity. In (1), we can consider the geometric multiplicity of the critical scheme (see Proposition A.7). In (2), we may view the set of such objects as the intersection of some Schubert cells in a Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}(N+1, \mathbb{C}_d[x])$ and hence, there is an associated intersection multiplicity (which is in this case the same as the geometric multiplicity at the given V of the intersection of Schubert cells). In this paper, we show that these multiplicities agree (Theorems 1.7, 3.2, and corollaries 1.8, 3.4).

One consequence of such an agreement, is that intersection numbers in Grassmannians can be calculated from the critical scheme of master functions and vice versa. As indicated in [MV], this relation provides a link via critical schemes of master functions, between representation theory of sl_{N+1} and Schubert calculus (see [B] for a different geometric approach).

A related consequence is that the intersection of associated Schubert cells is transverse at V if and only if the associated critical scheme is of geometric multiplicity 1.

A note on our methods: We show the equalities of multiplicities by using Grothendieck's scheme theory. To obtain statement on multiplicities, we need to show that the correspondences are in fact isomorphisms of (appropriate) schemes. By Grothendieck's functorial approach to schemes, this aim will be achieved if we can replace $\mathbb{C}$ in [MV] by an arbitrary local ring A and show that the correspondences hold with objects over A.

This requires us to develop the theory of Wronskian equations over an arbitrary local ring, in particular to develop criteria for solvability in a purely algebraic manner (see Lemma A.1). We also need to revisit key arguments in [MV] and modify their proof so that they apply over any local ring (see Theorem 2.5).

0.1. **Notation.** For a ring A, let $A_d[x]$ denote the set of polynomials with coefficients in A of degree $\leq d$. An element in $A[x]$ is said to be monic, if its leading coefficient is invertible. The multiplicative group of units in A is denoted by A^*.

For a ring A and elements $y_1, \dots, y_k \in A$, we will denote by $(y_1, \dots, y_k)$, the ideal generated by the y_i in A.

A local ring $(A, \mathfrak{m})$ over $\mathbb{C}$ is a Noetherian ring A containing $\mathbb{C}$ with a unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. The residue field of the local ring is defined to be $A/\mathfrak{m}$. We will only consider local rings containing $\mathbb{C}$ with residue field $\mathbb{C}$. A scheme in the paper stands for an algebraic scheme over $\mathbb{C}$.

We denote the permutation group of the set $\{1, \dots, N\}$ by Σ_N.

1. Formulation of the main result

1.1. **Some preliminaries.** For a vector bundle $\mathcal{W}$ on a scheme X, denote by $\mathrm{Fl}(\mathcal{W}) \to X$ the fiber bundle whose fiber over a point $x \in X$ is the flag variety of complete filtrations of the fiber $\mathcal{W}_x$.

Let W be a vector space of rank $d+1$ and N, $0 \le N \le d$, an integer. There is a natural exact sequence of vector bundles on the Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W)$,

$$0 \ \to\ \mathcal{V} \ \to\ W \otimes \mathcal{O} \to\ \mathcal{Q} \ \to\ 0\ .$$

The fiber of this sequence at a point $V \in \mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W)$ is

$$0 \ \to\ V \ \to\ W \ \to\ W/V \ \to\ 0\ .$$

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a complete flag on W:

$$\mathcal{F}\ :\ \{0\} = F_0 \ \subsetneq F_1 \ \subsetneq\ \dots\ \subsetneq\ F_{d+1} \ =\ W\ .$$

A *ramification sequence* is a sequence $\mathbf{a}$ of the form $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ such that $a_1 \ge \dots \ge a_k \ge 0$. For a ramification sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{N+1})$ satisfying $a_1 \le d - N$, define the Schubert cell

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F}) \ =\ \{&V \in \mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W) \mid \mathrm{rk}(V \cap F_u) = \ell,\\ &d - N + \ell - a_\ell \le u < d - N + \ell + 1 - a_{\ell+1},\ \ell = 0, \dots, N+1\}\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where $a_0 = d - N$, $a_{N+2} = 0$. The cell $\Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F})$ is a smooth connected variety. The closure of $\Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F})$ is denoted by $\Omega_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F})$. The codimension of $\Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F})$ is

$$|\mathbf{a}| \ =\ a_1 \ +\ a_2 \ +\ \dots\ +\ a_{N+1}\ .$$

Every $N+1$-dimensional vector subspace of W belongs to a unique Schubert cell $\Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F})$.

Denote by $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{a}}$ the pull back of $\mathcal{V}$ to $\Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W)$. There is *the distinguished section* of

$$\mathrm{Fl}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{a}}) \ \to\ \Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F})$$

which assigns to a point $V \in \Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F})$ the complete filtration

$$0 \ \subsetneq F_{d-N+1-a_1} \cap V \ \subsetneq F_{d-N+2-a_2} \cap V \ \subsetneq\ \dots\ \subsetneq\ F_{d-N+N+1-a_{N+1}} \cap V = V\ .$$

This section may be used to partition each fiber $\mathrm{Fl}((\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{a}})_V)$ into Schubert cells (see definitions in Section 1.2). This partition varies algebraically with V. That is, there is a decomposition of $\mathrm{Fl}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{a}})$ into relative Schubert cells each of which is a locally trivial (in the Zariski topology) fiber bundle over $\Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F})$.

1.2. **Schubert cells in flag varieties.** Let V be a vector space of rank $N+1$, $\mathcal{F}$ a complete flag on V and $w \in \Sigma_{N+1}$. Define the Schubert cell $G^o_w(\mathcal{F})$ correponding to w to be the subset of $\mathrm{Fl}(V)$ formed by points $V_1 \subsetneq V_2 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq V_{N+1} = V$ such that there exists a basis $u_1, \ldots, u_{N+1}$ of V satisfying the conditions

$$V_i \ = \ \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\,(u_1, \ldots u_i), \ \ u_i \in F_{w(i)}, \ i = 1, \ldots, N+1 \ .$$

It is easy to see that

$$\mathrm{Fl}(V) \ = \ \bigsqcup_{w \in \Sigma_{N+1}} G^o_w(\mathcal{F}) \ .$$

It is easy to see that the permutation of highest length gives the *open cell* in this partition of $\mathrm{Fl}(V)$.

1.3. **Intersection theory in the space of functions.** Let $W = \mathbb{C}_d[x]$ be the space of polynomials of degree not greater than d. Each point $z \in \mathbb{C} \cup \infty$ determines a full flag in W:

$$\mathcal{F}(z) \ : 0 = F_0(z) \ \subsetneq \ F_1(z) \ \subsetneq \ \ldots \ \subsetneq \ F_{d+1}(z) = W$$

where for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and i, $F_i(z) = (x-z)^{d+1-i}\mathbb{C}[x] \cap W$, and if $z = \infty$, then $F_i(z)$ is the space of polynomials of degree $< i$.

For $V \in \mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W)$ and $z \in \mathbb{C} \cup \infty$, there exists a unique ramification sequence $\mathbf{a}(z) = (a_1, \ldots, a_{N+1})$, with $a_1 \leq d - N$, such that $V \in \Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}(z)}(\mathcal{F}(z))$. The sequence is called *the ramification sequence of V at z.*

If $z \in \mathbb{C}$, then this means that V has a basis of the form

$$(x-z)^{N+1-1+a_1} f_1, \ (x-z)^{N+1-2+a_2} f_2, \ \ldots, \ (x-z)^{N+1-(N+1)+a_{N+1}} f_{N+1}$$

with $f_i(z) \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N+1$. The numbers $\{N+1-i+a_i \mid i = 1, \ldots, N+1\}$, are called the *exponents* of V at z.

If $z = \infty$, then the condition is that V has a basis of the form $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_{N+1}$ with $\deg\, f_i = d-(N+1)+i-a_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N+1$. The numbers $\{d-(N+1)+i-a_i, \mid i = 1, \ldots, N+1\}$, are called the *exponents* of V at ∞.

Remark 1.1. The set of exponents of V at any point in $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ is a subset of $\{0, \ldots, d\}$ of cardinality $N+1$.

A point $z \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ is called *a ramification point of V* if $\mathbf{a}(z)$ is a sequence with at least one nonzero term.

For a finite dimensional subspace $E \subseteq \mathbb{C}[x]$, define the Wronskian $\mathrm{Wr}(E) \in \mathbb{C}[x]/\mathbb{C}^*$ as the Wronskian of a basis of E. The Wronskian of a subspace is a nonzero polynomial with the following properties.

Lemma 1.2. *If $V \subseteq W$ lies in the Schubert cell $\Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F}(z)) \subseteq \mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W)$ for some $z \in \mathbb{C}$, then $\mathrm{Wr}(V)$ has a root at z of multiplicity $|\mathbf{a}|$.*

If $V \in \Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F}(\infty))$, then $\deg\, \mathrm{Wr}(V) = (N+1)(d-N) - |\mathbf{a}|$.

We will fix the following objects:

- A space of polynomials $W = \mathbb{C}_d[x]$;
- A Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W)$ with the universal subbundle $\mathcal{V}$;
- Distinct points $z_1, \dots, z_n$ on $\mathbb{C}$;
- At each point z_s, a ramification sequence $\mathbf{a}(z_s)$ and at ∞, a ramification sequence $\mathbf{a}(\infty)$ so that

$$\sum_{z\in\{z_1,\dots,z_n\}} |\mathbf{a}(z)| + |\mathbf{a}(\infty)| = \dim \mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W) \;=\; (N+1)(d-N). \tag{1.1}$$

We set

$$\Omega \;=\; \bigcap_{s=1}^{n} \Omega^{o}_{\mathbf{a}(z_s)}(\mathcal{F}(z_s)) \;\cap\; \Omega^{o}_{a(\infty)}(\mathcal{F}(\infty)) \;,$$

$$K_i = \prod_{s=1}^{n} (x-z_s)^{\sum_{\ell=1}^{i} a_{N+1-i+\ell}(z_s)} \;, \qquad i = 1, \dots, N+1 \;,$$

$$T_i = \; K_{i+1}K_{i-1}/K_i^2 \;=\; \prod_{s=1}^{n} (x-z_s)^{a_{N+1-i}(z_s)-a_{N+2-i}(z_s)} \;, \qquad i = 1, \dots, N \;.$$

We set $K_0 = 1$. Notice that T_i is a polynomial.

The collection of these objects will be called the "*basic situation*".

Remark 1.3. The following are basic facts from intersection theory in the space of polynomials.

- Ω is a finite scheme, its support is a finite set.
- In the definition of Ω, we intersected Schubert cells. We obtain the same intersection if we intersect the closures of the same Schubert cells:

$$\Omega \;=\; \bigcap_{s=1}^{n} \Omega_{\mathbf{a}(z_s)}(\mathcal{F}(z_s)) \;\cap\; \Omega_{\mathbf{a}(\infty)}(\mathcal{F}(\infty)) \;.$$

Define Fl as a pull back

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathrm{Fl} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi"] & \mathrm{Fl}(\mathcal{V}) \arrow[d] \\ \Omega \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W) \end{tikzcd} \tag{1.2}$$

Points of Fl are pairs $(V, E_\bullet)$ where $V \in \Omega$ and $E_\bullet = (E_1 \subsetneq E_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq E_{N+1} = V)$ is a complete filtration of V. For $V \in \Omega$, there are $n+1$ *distinguished complete filtrations on* V corresponding respectively to the flags $\mathcal{F}(z_1)$, $\mathcal{F}(z_2), \dots, \mathcal{F}(z_n)$, and $\mathcal{F}(\infty)$ of W.

Let U be the open subset of Fl formed by points $(V, E_\bullet)$ such that $E_\bullet$ lies in the intersection of $n+1$ open Schubert cells corresponding respectively to the $n+1$ distinguished complete filtrations on V. This condition on $E_\bullet$ is equivalent to the statement that for $i = 1, \dots, N+1$ and $z \in \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$, the subspace E_i has ramification sequence $(a_{N+1-i+1}(z), \dots, a_{N+1}(z))$ at z.

The subset U is dense in each fiber of $\mathrm{Fl} \to \Omega$.

Consider the subset $\mathrm{Fl}^o \subseteq U$ formed by points $(V, E_\bullet)$ such that for $i = 1, \dots, N-1$, the subspaces $E_i \subset \mathbb{C}[x]$ and $E_{i+1} \subset \mathbb{C}[x]$ do not have common ramification points in $\mathbb{C} - \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$, i.e. their Wronskians do not have common roots in $\mathbb{C} - \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$.

Lemma 1.4. Fl^o *is open and dense in each fiber of* $U \to \Omega$.

Proof. We recall the proof from [MV], Lemma 5.19. The requirement for E_i and E_{i+1} to have common ramification at a given $t \in \mathbb{P}^1 - \{z_1, \dots, z_s, \infty\}$ is at least "2 conditions". Taking into account the one parameter variation of t, it is easy to see that $U - \mathrm{Fl}^o$ is of codimension at least one. Hence the inclusions $\mathrm{Fl}^o \subseteq U \subseteq \mathrm{Fl}$ are open and dense. ☐

Suppose $(V, E_\bullet) \in \mathrm{Fl}^o$. Then for $i = 1, \dots, N+1$, the polynomial $\mathrm{Wr}(E_i)$ is divisible by K_i and is of degree $i\,(d-i+1) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{i} a_{N+1-i+\ell}(\infty)$. Introduce the polynomial y_i by the condition $\mathrm{Wr}(E_i) = K_i\, y_i$. The nonzero polynomial y_i is defined up to multiplication by a number.

(α) If l_i is the degree of y_i, then

$$l_i \;=\; i\,(d-i+1) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{i} a_{N+1-i+\ell}(\infty) - \sum_{s=1}^{n}\sum_{\ell=1}^{i} a_{N+1-i+\ell}(z_s)\ . \tag{1.3}$$

In particular, y_{N+1} is of degree 0.

(β) The polynomial y_i has no roots in the set $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$.

The fact that E_i and E_{i+1} have no common ramification points in $\mathbb{C} - \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ translates to the property

(γ) The polynomials y_i and y_{i+1} have no common roots.

Set $y_0 = 1$.

Suppose that $u_1, \dots, u_{N+1}$ is a basis of V such that for any $i = 1, \dots, N$, the elements $u_1, \dots, u_i$ form a basis of E_i. Let $Q_i = \mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}, u_{i+1}) / K_i$.

Lemma 1.5. $\mathrm{Wr}(y_i, Q_i) = T_i\, y_{i-1}\, y_{i+1}$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, N$.

Proof.

$$K_i^2\, \mathrm{Wr}(y_i, Q_i) \;=\; \mathrm{Wr}(K_i\, y_i,\, K_i\, Q_i) \;=\; \mathrm{Wr}(\mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \dots, u_i), \mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}, u_{i+1}))\ .$$

By Lemma A.4 in [MV], the above quantity equals

$$\mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \dots, u_{i-1})\, \mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \dots, u_{i+1}) \;=\; K_{i-1}\, y_{i-1}\, K_{i+1}\, y_{i+1} \;=\; T_i\, y_i\, y_{i+1}\, K_i^{\,2}\ .$$

Finally, divide both sides by K_i^2. ☐

By Lemma 1.5, any multiple root of y_i is a root of either T_i, y_{i-1}, or y_{i+1}. Clearly we have

(δ) The polynomial y_i has no multiple roots.

(η) There exist $\tilde{y}_i \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ such that $\mathrm{Wr}(y_i, \tilde{y}_i) = T_i\, y_{i-1}\, y_{i+1}$, namely, $\tilde{y}_i = Q_i$.

We translate condition (η) into equations by using the following

Lemma 1.6. *Let* $y \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ *be a polynomial with no multiple roots and* $T \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ *any polynomial. Then equation* $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y, \tilde{y}) \,=\, T$ *has a solution* $\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ *if and only if* y *divides* $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y', T)$*.*

This lemma follows from Lemma A.1 below with $A = \mathbb{C}$.

Consider the space

$$R \;=\; \prod_{i=1}^{N} \,\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_{l_i}[x])$$

where l_i is given by (1.3).

Let R^o be the open subset of R formed by the tuples $(y_1, \dots, y_N)$ satisfying conditions $(\alpha) - (\delta)$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the subset of R^o defined by the condition

$$y_i \quad \text{divides} \quad \mathrm{Wr}(\,y_i',\, T_i y_{i-1} y_{i+1}) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \dots, N\ . \tag{1.4}$$

Using the monicity of y_i and long division, we can write the divisibility condition as a system of equations in the coefficients of y_i, y_{i-1}, and y_{i+1}. Hence $\mathcal{A}$ is a closed subscheme of R^o.

Consider the morphism

$$\Theta \;:\; \mathrm{Fl}^o \;\to\; R^o\ , \qquad (V, E_\bullet) \;\mapsto\; (y_1, \dots, y_N) \;=\; (\,\mathrm{Wr}(\,E_1)/K_1, \dots, \mathrm{Wr}(\,E_N)/K_N)\ .$$

For $x \in \mathrm{Fl}^o$, condition (η) holds and by Lemma A.1, Θ induces a morphism of schemes $\Theta : \mathrm{Fl}^o \to \mathcal{A}$.

Theorem 1.7. *The morphism* $\Theta \,:\, \mathrm{Fl}^o \,\to\, \mathcal{A}$ *is an isomorphism of schemes.*

It is proved in [MV] that Θ is a bijection of sets. In Section 2 we will extend the argument of [MV] to prove Theorem 1.7.

The following corollaries of Theorem 1.7 use the notion of the geometric multiplicity of an irreducible scheme. This notion, as well as its relation to intersection theory is reviewed in the appendix.

Corollary 1.8. *Let* $x \in \Omega$*. Let* $m(x)$ *be the length of the local ring of* Ω *at* x*. Let* C *be the irreducible component of* $\mathcal{A}$ *which, as a point set, is* $\Theta(\pi^{-1}(x) \cap \mathrm{Fl}^o)$*, see the Cartesian square (1.2). Then, the geometric multiplicity of* C *equals* $m(x)$*. In particular, the geometric multiplicity of* C *equals the geometric multiplicity of* Ω *at* x*.*

Proof. Let Ω_x be the component of Ω containing x. As a set, Ω_x is just the point x. Consider the irreducible component $\mathcal{I}$ of Fl^o containing $\pi^{-1}(x)$,

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathcal{I} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathrm{Fl} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi"] & \mathrm{Fl}(\mathcal{V}) \arrow[d] \\ \Omega_x \arrow[r] & \Omega \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W) \end{tikzcd} \tag{1.5}$$

Since π is a locally trivial fiber bundle, the morphism $\mathcal{I} \to \Omega_x$ is a fiber bundle with smooth fiber for the Zariski topology on the scheme Ω_x . The multiplicity of $\mathcal{I}$ is the same as the multiplicity of its dense subset $\mathcal{I} \cap \mathrm{Fl}^o$. The corollary now follows from the theorem and Proposition A.8. □

Corollary 1.9. *We have an equality of cohomology classes in $H^*(\mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W))$,*

$$[\Omega_{\mathbf{a}(\infty)}(\mathcal{F}(\infty))] \ \cdot \ \prod_{s=1}^{n} [\Omega_{\mathbf{a}(z_s)}(\mathcal{F}(z_s))] \ = \ c \ [\ \textit{class of a point} \ ]$$

where c is the sum of the geometric multiplicities of irreducible components of $\mathcal{A}$.

1.4. **Critical point equations.** Consider the space $\tilde{R} = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{C}^{l_i}$ with coordinates $(t_j^{(i)})$, where $i = 1, \dots, N, \quad j = 1, \dots, l_i$. The product of symmetric groups $\Sigma = \Sigma_{l_1} \times \cdots \times \Sigma_{l_N}$ acts on $\tilde{R}$ by permuting coordinates with the same upper index. Define a map

$$\Gamma \ : \ \tilde{R} \ \to \ R \ , \qquad (t_j^{(i)}) \ \mapsto \ (y_1, \dots, y_N) \ ,$$

where $y_i \ = \ \prod_{j=1}^{l_i} \ (x - t_j^{(i)})$. Define the scheme $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ by the condition $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \Gamma^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$. The natural map $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathcal{A}$ is finite and étale. The scheme $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is Σ-invariant. The scheme $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ lies in the Σ-invariant subspace $\tilde{R}^o$ of all $(t_j^{(i)})$ with the following properties for every i:

- The numbers $t_1^{(i)}, \dots, t_{l_i}^{(i)}$ are distinct;
- The sets $\{t_1^{(i)}, \dots, t_{l_i}^{(i)}\}$ and $\{t_1^{(i+1)}, \dots, t_{l_{i+1}}^{(i+1)}\}$ do not intersect;
- The sets $\{t_1^{(i)}, \dots, t_{l_i}^{(i)}\}$ and $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ do not intersect.

Lemma 1.10.

- *The connected components of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ are irreducible.*
- *The reduced schemes underlying $\mathcal{A}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ are smooth.*
- *If C is a connected component of $\mathcal{A}$, then the group Σ acts transitively on the connected components of $\Gamma^{-1}(C)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.7, $\mathcal{A}$ is isomorphic to Fl^o. The reduced scheme underlying Fl^o is smooth. Therefore the reduced scheme underlying $\mathcal{A}$ is smooth. Since Γ is étale, we deduce that the reduced scheme underlying $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is also smooth.

The smoothness conclusions immediately imply the irreducibility of connected components of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$.

The transitivity assertion follows from the fact that Γ is a Galois covering with Galois group Σ. □

Consider on $\tilde{R}^o$ the regular rational function

$$\Phi(t_j^{(i)}) \ = \ \prod_{i=1}^{N}\prod_{j=1}^{l_i} T_i(t_j^{(i)})^{-1} \ \prod_{i=1}^{N-1}\prod_{j=1}^{l_i}\prod_{k=1}^{l_{i+1}} (t_j^{(i)} - t_k^{(i+1)})^{-1} \ \prod_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{1 \le j < k \le l_i} (t_j^{(i)} - t_k^{(i)})^2 \ .$$

This Σ-invariant function is called *the master function associated with the basic situation.*

Define the scheme $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}'$ as the subscheme in $\tilde{R}^o$ of critical points of the master function.

Lemma 1.11. *The subschemes $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}'$ of $\tilde{R}^o$ coincide.*

Proof. The subscheme $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is defined by divisibility conditions (1.4). By Lemma A.4, the divisibility condition (1.4) for a fixed i, reduces to the critical point equations for the function

$$\prod_{j=1}^{l_i} T_i(t_j^{(i)})^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{l_i}\prod_{k=1}^{l_{i+1}} (t_j^{(i)} - t_k^{(i+1)})^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{l_i}\prod_{k=1}^{l_{i-1}} (t_k^{(i-1)} - t_j^{(i)})^{-1} \prod_{1\le j<k\le l_i} (t_j^{(i)} - t_k^{(i)})^2$$

of variables $t_1^{(i)}, \dots, t_{l_i}^{(i)}$. Then the system of divisibility conditions (1.4) for all i together is just the critical scheme of Φ. This concludes the proof. $\square$

Let $(V, E_\bullet) \in \mathrm{Fl}^o$. Denote $\boldsymbol{y} = \Theta(V, E_\bullet) \in \mathcal{A}$. Pick a point $\boldsymbol{t} \in \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{y})$. Let C be the unique irreducible component of $\mathcal{A}$ containing $\boldsymbol{y}$ and $\tilde{C}$ the unique irreducible component of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ containing $\boldsymbol{t}$.

Theorem 1.12. *The geometric multiplicity of the scheme Ω at V equals the geometric multiplicity of $\tilde{C}$.*

Proof. The morphism $\tilde{C} \to C$ is étale. By Proposition A.8, the geometric multiplicity of $\tilde{C}$ coincides with that of C. Now the theorem follows from Corollary 1.8. $\square$

The group Σ acts on the set of connected components of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. For an orbit of this action, define its geometric multiplicity to be the geometric multiplicity of any member of the orbit.

Corollary 1.13. *We have an equality of cohomology classes in $H^*(\mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W))$,*

$$[\Omega_{\mathbf{a}(\infty)}(\mathcal{F}(\infty))] \;\cdot\; \prod_{s=1}^{n} [\Omega_{\mathbf{a}(z_s)}(\mathcal{F}(z_s))] \;=\; c\ [\ \textit{class of a point}\ ]$$

where c is the number of orbits for the action of Σ on the connected components of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ counted with geometric multiplicity.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.7

2.1. **Admissible modules.** Let $(A, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local ring with residue field $\mathbb{C}$. A submodule $V \subset A[x]$ is said to be *an admissible submodule of rank $N+1$*, if

- The submodule $V \subset A[x]$ is a free A-module of rank $N+1$;
- The morphism $V \otimes A/\mathfrak{m} \to (A/\mathfrak{m})[x] = \mathbb{C}[x]$ is injective.

An admissible submodule $V \subset A[x]$ is said to have *the ramification sequence* $\mathbf{a}(z) = (a_1, \dots, a_{N+1})$ *at* $z \in \mathbb{C}$ if V has an A-basis

$$(x-z)^{N+1-1+a_1} f_1,\ (x-z)^{N+1-2+a_2} f_2,\ \dots,\ (x-z)^{N+1-(N+1)+a_{N+1}} f_{N+1}$$

with $f_i(z) \in A^*$ for $i = 1, \dots, N+1$.

An admissible submodule $V \subset A[x]$ is said to have *the ramification sequence* $\mathbf{a}(\infty) = (a_1, \dots, a_{N+1})$ *at* ∞ if V has an A-basis $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{N+1}$ with monic f_i and deg $f_i = d - (N+1) + i - a_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, N+1$.

Remark 2.1. Admissible modules $V \subset A[x]$ of rank $N+1$ are in one-to-one correspondence with morphisms $\mathrm{Spec}(A) \to \mathrm{Gr}(N+1, \mathbb{C}[x])$. Intuitively, if $A = \mathbb{C}[[t]]$, this is a formal holomorphic map of a $1-$disc into $\mathrm{Gr}(N+1, \mathbb{C}[x])$.

An admissible submodule $V \subset A[x]$ may not have a ramification sequence at a given $z \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. This corresponds intuitively, to the case when the formal map considered above does not remain in a Schubert cell. If V has a ramification sequence at z, then the ramification sequence is unique (equal to the ramification sequence of the subspace $V \otimes (A/\mathfrak{m}) \subset \mathbb{C}[x]$ at z).

For $f \in A[x]$, we denote by $\bar{f}$ the corresponding polynomial in $(A/\mathfrak{m})[x] = \mathbb{C}[x]$.

The following standard lemma is proved in Section A.2.

Lemma 2.2. *Let A be a local ring with residue field $\mathbb{C}$ and $V \subset A[x]$ a submodule. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. *The submodule V is admissible.*
2. *The submodule V is a finitely generated A-module, and there is an A-module decomposition $A[x] = V \oplus M$ for some A-module M.*
3. *For some k, there exist $u_1, \dots, u_k \in V$ such that V is the A-span of $u_1, \dots, u_k$ and the elements $\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_k \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}$.*

Lemma 2.3. *Let A be a local ring with residue field $\mathbb{C}$ and $V \subset A[x]$ an admissible submodule of rank $N+1$. Let $u_1, \dots, u_{N+1}$ be a basis of V as an A-module. Suppose $v \in A[x]$ satisfies the equation $\mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \dots, u_{N+1}, v) = 0$. Then $v \in V$.*

Lemma 2.3 is proved in Section 2.3.

2.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.7.** Our first objective will be to show that $\Theta : \mathrm{Fl}^o \to R^o$ is a closed embedding of schemes. Our second objective will be to show that $\mathrm{Fl}^o \to \mathcal{A}$ is an isomorphism of schemes.

Clearly the morphism $\Theta : \mathrm{Fl}^o \to R^o$ extends to a morphism of projective schemes $\tilde{\Theta} : \mathrm{Fl} \to R$ and $\mathrm{Fl}^o = \tilde{\Theta}^{-1}(R^o)$. The morphism $\tilde{\Theta}$ is closed as a morphism of projective schemes.

We achieve the first objective by showing that $\tilde{\Theta}$ is an embedding. By Lemma A.9, it will be enough to show that for every local ring A over $\mathbb{C}$, the morphism $\mathrm{Fl}(A) \to R(A)$ is an injective map of sets.

To achieve the second objective, by Lemma A.10, it will be enough to show that for any local ring A over $\mathbb{C}$, the induced map $\mathrm{Fl}^o(A) \to \mathcal{A}(A)$ is a set theoretic surjection.

To use these criteria, we need to define the sets $\mathrm{Fl}(A)$, $\mathrm{Fl}^o(A)$, $R(A)$, and $\mathcal{A}(A)$ more explicitly.

By Proposition A.11, the set $\mathrm{Fl}(A)$ is the set of pairs $(V, E_\bullet)$, such that

- $V \subset A[x]$ is an admissible submodule of rank $N+1$;
- $E_\bullet = (E_1 \subsetneq E_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq E_{N+1} = V)$ is a filtration by admissible submodules;
- V has the ramification sequence $(a_1(z), \dots, a_{N+1}(z))$ at each $z \in \{z_1, \dots, z_n, \infty\}$.

The subset $\mathrm{Fl}^o(A)$ is the set of $(V, E_\bullet) \in \mathrm{Fl}(A)$ such that the induced point in $\mathrm{Fl}(\mathbb{C})$ is a point of Fl^o.

The set $R(A)$ is the set

$$\{(y_1, \dots, y_N) \in \prod_{i=1}^{N} A_{l_i}[x] \ \mid \ \bar{y}_i \neq 0,\ i = 1, \dots, N\}$$

modulo the equivalence relation $(y_1, \dots, y_N) \sim (\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_N)$ if there exist $a_i \in A^*$ such that $a_i\, y_i = \tilde{y}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$.

The subset $\mathcal{A}(A)$ consists of elements $(y_1, \dots, y_N) \in R(A)$ such that

- For $i = 1, \dots, N$, condition (η) holds. By Lemma A.1, this implies that the polynomial y_i divides $\mathrm{Wr}(\, y_i',\, T_i\, y_{i-1}\, y_{i+1})$. Here $y_0 = y_{N+1} = 1$.
- The reduction $(\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_N) \in R(\mathbb{C})$ is a point of R^o.

Lemma 2.4. *The morphism $\tilde{\Theta} : \mathrm{Fl} \to R$ is a closed embedding of schemes.*

Proof. We need to show that $\tilde{\Theta} : \mathrm{Fl}(A) \to R(A)$ is a set theoretic injection for any local ring A.

Suppose $(V, E_\bullet)$ and $(V', E'_\bullet)$ are two points of $\mathrm{Fl}(A)$ with $\tilde{\Theta}(V, E_\bullet) = \tilde{\Theta}(V', E'_\bullet)$. Pick bases $(u_1, \dots, u_{N+1})$ and $(v_1, \dots, v_{N+1})$ for V and V' respectively so that for all i, the admissible submodule E_i is the A-span of $u_1, \dots, u_i$ and the admissible submodule E'_i is the A-span of $v_1, \dots, v_i$.

The hypothesis implies that $\mathrm{Wr}(\, u_1, \dots, u_i) \ = \ c_i\ \mathrm{Wr}(\, v_1, \dots, v_i)$ with $c_i \in A^*$. Clearly $E_1 = E'_1$. Assume by induction that $E_i = E'_i$. Then

$$\mathrm{Wr}(\, v_1, \dots, v_{i+1}) \ = \ c\ \mathrm{Wr}(\, u_1, \dots, u_i, v_{i+1}) \ = \ c'\ \mathrm{Wr}(\, u_1, \dots, u_i, u_{i+1})$$

for $c, c' \in A^*$. Therefore

$$\mathrm{Wr}(\, u_1, \dots, u_i,\, c v_{i+1} - c' u_{i+1}) \ = \ 0\ .$$

Lemma 2.3 implies $c v_{i+1} - c' u_{i+1} \in E_i$ and hence $E_{i+1} = E'_{i+1}$. □

We need to show that for any local ring A over $\mathbb{C}$, the induced map $\mathrm{Fl}^o(A) \to \mathcal{A}(A)$ is a set theoretic surjection. But this claim on surjectivity follows from the following theorem on the existence of solutions to Wronskian equations.

Let $T_0,\, T_1,\, \dots, T_N\, \in \mathbb{C}[x] \subseteq A[x]$ be non-zero polynomials. Let $S\, \subset\, \mathbb{C}$ be the union of their zero sets. Set $K_i \ = \ T_0^{i}\, T_1^{i-1}\, T_2^{i-2}\, \cdots\, T_{i-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N+1$.

Let $y_1, \dots, y_N \in A[x]$ be monic polynomials of arbitrary degree. Set $y_0 \ = \ y_{N+1} \ = \ 1$. For $z \in S$ and $i = 1, \dots, N+1$, define

$$e_i(z) \ = \ i - 1 + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \mathrm{ord}_z\, T_j\ , \qquad c_i \ = \ i - 1 + \deg\, y_i \ - \ \deg\, y_{i-1} \ + \ \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \deg\, T_j\ .$$

Theorem 2.5. *Under these conditions assume that for all* i

- *The polynomial* $\bar{y}_i \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ *has no multiple roots, no roots in* S*, and is coprime to* $\bar{y}_{i+1}$*;*
- *The polynomial* y_i *divides* $\mathrm{Wr}(\, y_i',\, T_i\, y_{i-1}\, y_{i+1})$*.*

Then, there exist $u_1, \ldots, u_{N+1} \in A[x]$ *with the following properties. Set* E_i *to be the* A*-span of* $u_1, \ldots, u_i$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, N+1$ *and set* $V \,=\, E_{N+1}$*. Then for all* i

1. $\mathrm{Wr}(\, u_1, \ldots, u_i) \;=\; K_i\, y_i$*;*
2. $E_i \subset A[x]$ *is admissible;*
3. E_i *has ramification sequences at each* $z \in S \cup \{\infty\}$*. The set of exponents at* $z \in S$ *is* $\{e_1(z), \ldots, e_i(z)\}$*. The set of exponents at* ∞ *is* $\{c_1, \ldots, c_i\}$*.*

Theorem 2.5 is proved in Section 2.4.

Let $(y_1, \ldots, y_N) \in \mathcal{A}(A)$. Apply Theorem 2.5 and obtain a point $(V, E_\bullet)$. It is easy to see that $(V, E_\bullet) \in \mathrm{Fl}^o(A)$ and $\Theta(V, E_\bullet) = (y_1, \ldots, y_N)$. The proof of Theorem 1.7 is complete.

2.3. **Proof of Lemma 2.3.** Let $\mathfrak{m} \subset A$ be the maximal ideal. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_{N+1} \in V$ be a basis, $u_i \,=\, \sum_l a_l^i\, x^l$ with $a_i^l \in A$.

If necessary changing the basis, we may assume the basis has the following property. There exist nonnegative integers $k_1 > \cdots > k_{N+1}$ such that

$$a^j_{k_i} \;=\; 0 \text{ for } j \neq i\ ; \qquad a^i_{k_i} \;\in\; A - m\ ; \qquad a^i_j \;\in m \text{ for } j \;>\; a^i_{k_i}\ .$$

Let $v \,=\, \sum_l b_l\, x^l$ be a nonzero polynomial such that $\mathrm{Wr}(\, u_1, \ldots, u_{N+1}, v) \,=\, 0$. We may assume that $b_{k_i} = 0$ for all i. We shall prove that this leads to contradiction.

Recall that for any nonzero $a \in A$, there is a unique r such that $a \in m^r - m^{r+1}$, see Krull's intersection theorem ([M], Theorem 8.10).

Let r be the smallest number such that some b_l is in $m^r - m^{r+1}$, and p the largest index such that $b_p \,\in\, m^r \,-\, m^{r+1}$. Clearly $p \,\notin\, \{k_1, \ldots, k_{N+1}\}$. The polynomial $\mathrm{Wr}(\, u_1, \ldots, u_{N+1}, v)$ is nonzero since in its decomposition into monomials, the coefficient of the monomial $\mathrm{Wr}(\, x^{k_1}, \ldots, x^{k_{N+1}}, x^p)$ belongs to $m^r - m^{r+1}$.

2.4. **Proof of Theorem 2.5.** The proof follows [MV]. Call a tuple $(y_1, \ldots, y_N)$ *fertile* if it satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.5.

For $i = 1, \ldots, N$, define the process of reproduction in the i-th direction. Namely, find a solution $\tilde{y}_i \in A[x]$ to the equation $\mathrm{Wr}(\, y_i, \tilde{y}_i) \,=\, T_i\, y_{i+1}\, y_{i-1}$. If $\tilde{y}_i$ is a solution, then for $c \in A$, the polynomial $\tilde{y}_i + c y_i$ is a solution too. Add to $\tilde{y}_i$ the term $c y_i$ if necessary, and obtain a monic $\tilde{y}_i$ such that its reduction modulo the maximal ideal does not have roots in S, does not have multiple roots, and has no common roots with reductions of y_{i-1} or y_{i+1}. The transformation from the tuple $(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ to $(y_1, \ldots, y_{i-1}, \tilde{y}_i, y_{i+1}, \ldots, y_N)$ is the process of reproduction in the i-th direction.

Claim: *The tuple* $(y_1, \ldots, \tilde{y}_i, \ldots, y_N)$ *is fertile.*

To prove the claim it is enough to show that

$$y_{i-1} \text{ divides } \mathrm{Wr}(y'_{i-1}, T_{i-1}\, y_{i-2}\, \tilde{y}_i) \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$y_{i+1} \text{ divides } \mathrm{Wr}(y'_{i+1}, T_{i+1}\, y_{i+2}\, \tilde{y}_i)\ . \tag{2.2}$$

We prove (2.1). Statement (2.2) is proved similarly.

Clearly, y_{i-1} divides $\mathrm{Wr}(y_i,\ \tilde{y}_i)$. By assumption, y_{i-1} divides $\mathrm{Wr}(y'_{i-1},\ T_{i-1}\, y_{i-2}\, y_i)$. By Jacobi's rule,

$$\mathrm{Wr}(y'_{i-1},\ T_{i-1}\ y_{i-2}\, \tilde{y}_i)\ y_i\ -\ \mathrm{Wr}(y'_{i-1},\ T_{i-1}\, y_{i-2}\, y_i)\ \tilde{y}_i\ =\ \mathrm{Wr}(y_i, , \tilde{y}_i)\ T_{i-1}\, y_{i-2}\, y'_{i-1}\ .$$

Hence y_{i-1} divides $\mathrm{Wr}(y'_{i-1},\ T_{i-1}\, y_{i-2}\, \tilde{y}_i)\ y_i$. By assumption, the ideal $(\bar{y}_{i-1}, \bar{y}_i)\ =\ \mathbb{C}[x]$. By Lemma A.3, this implies that the ideal $(y_{i-1}, y_i) = A[x]$. Now use Lemma A.5 to see that y_{i-1} divides $\mathrm{Wr}(y'_{i-1},\ T_{i-1}\, y_{i-2}\, \tilde{y}_i)$. This proves (2.1) and the claim.

To construct the polynomials $u_1, \ldots, u_{N+1}$ we do the following. We set $u_1\ =\ K_1\, y_1$. To construct the polynomial u_{i+1}, for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, we perform the simple reproduction procedure in the i-th direction and obtain the tuple $(y_1, \ldots, \tilde{y}_i, \ldots, y_N)$. Next we perform for $(y_1, \ldots, \tilde{y}_i, \ldots, y_N)$ the simple reproduction procedure in the direction of $i - 1$ and obtain $(y_1, \ldots, \tilde{y}_{i-1}, \tilde{y}_i, \ldots, y_N)$. We repeat this procedure all the way until the simple reproduction procedure in the 1st direction and obtain $(\tilde{y}_1, \ldots, \tilde{y}_{i-1}, \tilde{y}_i, \ldots, y_N)$. We set $u_{i+1} = K_1 \tilde{y}_1$.

Claim: *We have* $\mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \ldots, u_i)\ =\ K_i\, y_i$ *for* $i = 2, \ldots, N + 1$.

We prove the claim by induction. Let $(y_1, \ldots, \tilde{y}_i, \ldots, y_N)$ be the tuple obtained by the simple reproduction in the i-th direction. Apply induction to the tuple $(y_1, \ldots, \tilde{y}_i, \ldots, y_N)$ to obtain $\mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}, u_{i+1})\ =\ K_i\, \tilde{y}_i$. Induction applied to the tuple $(y_1, \ldots, y_i, \ldots, y_N)$ gives $\mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}, u_i)\ = K_i\ y_i$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \ldots, u_{i+1})\, \mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1})\ &=\ \mathrm{Wr}(\mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}, u_i),\ \mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}, u_{i+1}))\\ &=\ \mathrm{Wr}(K_i\, y_i,\ K_i\, \tilde{y}_i)\ =\ K_i^2\ T_i\ y_{i_1}\ y_{i+1}\ .\end{aligned}$$

By induction we also have $\mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}) = K_{i-1}\, y_{i-1}$ and $T_i\ =\ K_{i+1}\, K_{i-1}/K_i^2$. The above equation rearranges to $\mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \ldots, u_{i+1})\, K_{i-1}\, y_{i-1}\ =\ K_{i+1}\, K_{i-1}\, y_{i-1}\, y_{i+1}$, which gives the desired equality $\mathrm{Wr}(u_1, \ldots, u_{i+1}) = K_{i+1}\, y_{i+1}$.

Return to the proof of Theorem 2.5. Let E_i be the A-span of $u_1, \ldots, u_i$. Then $\mathrm{Wr}(\bar{u}_1, \ldots, \bar{u}_i) = \bar{K}_i\, \bar{y}_i = K_i\, \bar{y}_i\ \neq 0$. By part (3) of Lemma 2.2, the submodule $E_i \subset A[x]$ is admissible. This proves (1) and (2) of the theorem.

Now we will calculate the exponents of E_i at $z \in S$. The exponents of E_i at ∞ are calculated similarly.

By induction assume that the set of exponents of E_i at z is $\{e_1(z), \dots, e_i(z)\}$. That means that E_i has an A-basis $v_1, \dots, v_i$ such that $v_j = (x-z)^{e_j(z)}\, a_j$ with $a_j(z) \in A^*$ for all j. Hence $\mathrm{Wr}(\, E_i)$ is of the form $(x-z)^b\, a$ with

$$b \;=\; \sum_{\ell=1}^{i} e_\ell(z) \;-\; \frac{i\,(i-1)}{2}\;, \qquad a(z) \in A^*\;.$$

We have $b = \mathrm{ord}_z\; K_i$ since $\mathrm{Wr}(\, E_i) = K_i\, y_i$.

Let $v_{i+1} \in E_{i+1}$ be such that $v_1, \dots, v_i, v_{i+1}$ is an A-basis of E_{i+1}. We may assume that $v_{i+1} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{d} c_\ell\; (x-z)^\ell$ with coefficients c_ℓ equal to zero for $\ell \in \{e_1(z), \dots, e_i(z)\}$. Let p be the smallest integer with $c_p \neq 0$. It is easy to see that the Wronskian of E_{i+1} equals $(x-z)^{b+p-i}\, h$ where $h(z)$ is c_p up to multiplication by an element in A^*. From equation $\mathrm{Wr}(\, E_{i+1}) \;=\; K_{i+1}\, y_{i+1}$ we deduce that $\mathrm{Wr}(\, E_{i+1})$ is of the form $(x-z)^{\mathrm{ord}_z\; K_{i+1}}\, g$ with $g(z) \in A^*$. Hence $b+p-i = \mathrm{ord}_z\; K_{i+1}$, $p = e_{i+1}(z)$, and $c_p \in A^*$.

This reason shows that $e_{i+1}(z)$ does not belong to the set $\{e_1(z), \dots, e_i(z)\}$. Thus E_{i+1} has a ramification sequence at z and the set of exponents at z is $\{e_1(z), \dots, e_i(z), e_{i+1}(z)\}$. The induction step is complete.

3. Schubert cells and critical points

Let Σ_{N+1} be the permutation group of the set $\{1, \dots, N+1\}$ and $w \in \Sigma_{N+1}$. Assume that a basic situation of Section 1.3 is given. In Section 1.3, we defined a flag bundle Fl over Ω. We also observed that $V \in \Omega$ has $n+1$ distinguished complete flags on V induced from the complete flags $\mathcal{F}(z_1), \dots, \mathcal{F}(z_n)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\infty)$ of W.

Let $\{c_1 > \dots > c_{N+1}\}$ be the set $\{d - (N+1) + j - a_j(\infty) \mid j = 1, \dots, N+1\}$ of exponents of V at ∞.

We define a subset $\mathrm{Fl}^o_w \subset \mathrm{Fl}$ as follows. Let U_w be the subset of Fl formed by points $(V, E_\bullet)$ such that

- $E_\bullet \in \mathrm{Fl}(V)$ lies in the intersection of n open Schubert cells corresponding respectively to the n distinguished complete flags on V induced from the flags $\mathcal{F}(z_1), \dots, \mathcal{F}(z_n)$. This condition on $E_\bullet$ is equivalent to the statement that for $i = 1, \dots, N+1$ and $z \in \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$, the subspace E_i has ramification sequence $(a_{N+1-i+1}(z), \dots,\, a_{N+1}(z))$.
- $E_\bullet \in \mathrm{Fl}(V)$ lies in the Schubert cell, corresponding to the permutation w and the distinguished complete flag on V induced from the flag $\mathcal{F}(\infty)$. This condition on $E_\bullet$ is equivalent to the statement that the set of exponents of E_i at ∞ is $\{c_{w(1)}, \dots, c_{w(i)}\}$.

We define $\mathrm{Fl}^o_w \subseteq U_w$ as the subset of points $(V, E_\bullet)$ such that for all i, the subspaces $E_i \subset \mathbb{C}[x]$ and $E_{i+1} \subset \mathbb{C}[x]$ do not have common ramification points in $\mathbb{C} - \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$.

Notice that the subset Fl^o_w may be empty if w is not the identity element in Σ_{N+1}.

Lemma 3.1. *The morphism* $\mathrm{Fl}^o_w \to \Omega$ *is smooth.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the subset of Fl formed by points $(V, E_\bullet)$ such that $E_\bullet$ lies in the Schubert cell corresponding to the permutation w and the distinguished flag on V induced from $\mathcal{F}(\infty)$. It is easy to see that U_w is an open subset of $\mathcal{J}$ and therefore it suffices to show that $\mathcal{J} \to \Omega$ is smooth.

Denote by $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{a}(\infty)}$ the pull back of $\mathcal{V}$ to $\Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}(\infty)}(\mathcal{F}(\infty)) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W)$. There is a distinguished section of $\mathrm{Fl}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{a}(\infty)}) \to \Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}(\infty)}(\mathcal{F}(\infty))$, see Section 1.1. Let $G_w^{\mathcal{F}(\infty)} \subset \mathrm{Fl}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{a}(\infty)})$ be the part corresponding to w in the partition of $\mathrm{Fl}(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{a}(\infty)})$ into Schubert cells associated to this distinguished section.

There is a fiber square

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{J} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & G_w^{\mathcal{F}(\infty)} \arrow[d, "p"] \\
\Omega \arrow[r] & \Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}(\infty)}(\mathcal{F}(\infty))
\end{tikzcd}$$

The morphism p is clearly smooth. The morphism $\mathcal{J} \to \Omega$ is the base change of a smooth morphism and hence it is smooth too. □

Let $(V, E_\bullet) \in \mathrm{Fl}^o_w$. For $i = 1, \dots, N+1$, the polynomial $\mathrm{Wr}(E_i)$ is divisible by K_i and has degree $\sum_{j=1}^i c_{w(j)} - i(i-1)/2$. Introduce the polynomial y_i by the condition $\mathrm{Wr}(E_i) = K_i\, y_i$.

$(\alpha)_w$ If l_i^w is the degree of y_i, then $l_i^w = \sum_{j=1}^i c_{w(j)} - i(i+1)/2 - \deg K_i$. In particular, y_{N+1} is of degree 0.

$(\beta)_w$ The polynomial y_i has no roots in the set $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$.

$(\gamma)_w$ The polynomials y_i and y_{i+1} have no common roots.

$(\delta)_w$ The polynomial y_i has no multiple roots.

$(\eta)_w$ There exist $\tilde{y}_i \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ such that $\mathrm{Wr}(y_i, \tilde{y}_i) = T_i\, y_{i-1}\, y_{i+1}$.

Consider the space

$$R_w = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_{l_i^w}[x])$$

where l_i^w is given by property $(\alpha)_w$.

Let R_w^o be the open subset of R_w formed by the tuples $(y_1, \dots, y_N)$ satisfying conditions $(\alpha)_w - (\delta)_w$. Let $\mathcal{A}_w$ be the subset of R^o defined by the condition

$$y_i \quad \text{divides} \quad \mathrm{Wr}(y_i', T_i y_{i-1} y_{i+1}) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \dots, N\ , \tag{3.1}$$

Using the monicity of y_i and long division, we can write the divisibility condition as a system of equations in the coefficients of y_i, y_{i-1}, and y_{i+1}. Hence $\mathcal{A}_w$ is a closed subscheme of R_w^o,

Consider the morphism

$$\Theta_w \ :\ \mathrm{Fl}^o_w \ \to\ R^o_w\ , \qquad (V, E_\bullet)\ \mapsto\ (y_1, \dots, y_N)\ =\ (\,\mathrm{Wr}(E_1)/K_1, \dots, \mathrm{Wr}(E_N)/K_N)\ .$$

For $x \in \mathrm{Fl}^o_w$, condition $(\eta)_w$ holds and by Lemma 1.6, Θ induces a morphism of schemes $\Theta : \mathrm{Fl}^o_w \to \mathcal{A}_w$.

Theorem 3.2. *The morphism* $\Theta_w : \mathrm{Fl}^o_w \to \mathcal{A}_w$ *is an isomorphism of schemes.*

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is similar to that of Theorem 1.7. Notice that in Theorem 2.5, no assumptions were made on the degrees of $y_1, \dots, y_N$.

Consider the space $\tilde{R}_w = \prod_{i=1}^N \mathbb{C}^{l^w_i}$ with coordinates $(t^{(i)}_j)$, where $i = 1, \dots, N,\ \ j = 1, \dots, l^w_i$. The product of symmetric groups $\Sigma^w = \Sigma_{l^w_1} \times \dots \times \Sigma_{l^w_N}$ acts on $\tilde{R}$ by permuting coordinates with the same upper index. Define a map

$$\Gamma \ : \ \tilde{R}_w \ \to \ R \ , \qquad (t^{(i)}_j) \ \mapsto \ (y_1, \dots, y_N) \ ,$$

where $y_i \ = \ \prod_{j=1}^{l^w_i} (x - t^{(i)}_j)$. Define the scheme $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_w$ by the condition $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_w = \Gamma^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_w)$. The natural map $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_w \to \mathcal{A}$ is finite and étale. The scheme $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_w$ is Σ^w-invariant. The scheme $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_w$ lies in the Σ^w-invariant subspace $\tilde{R}^o$ of all $(t^{(i)}_j)$ with the following properties for every i:

- The numbers $t^{(i)}_1, \dots, t^{(i)}_{l^w_i}$ are distinct;
- The sets $\{t^{(i)}_1, \dots, t^{(i)}_{l^w_i}\}$ and $\{t^{(i+1)}_1, \dots, t^{(i+1)}_{l^w_{i+1}}\}$ do not intersect;
- The sets $\{t^{(i)}_1, \dots, t^{(i)}_{l^w_i}\}$ and $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ do not intersect.

The following lemma is proved in the same manner as Lemma 1.10.

Lemma 3.3.

- *The connected components of* $\mathcal{A}_w$ *and* $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_w$ *are irreducible.*
- *The reduced schemes underlying* $\mathcal{A}_w$ *and* $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_w$ *are smooth.*
- *If* C *is a connected component of* $\mathcal{A}_w$*, then the group* Σ^w *acts transitively on the connected components of* $\Gamma^{-1}(C)$*.*

Consider on $\tilde{R}^o_w$ the regular rational function

$$\Phi_w(t^{(i)}_j) \ = \ \prod_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{j=1}^{l^w_i} T_i(t^{(i)}_j)^{-1} \ \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^{l^w_i} \prod_{k=1}^{l^w_{i+1}} (t^{(i)}_j - t^{(i+1)}_k)^{-1} \ \prod_{i=1}^{N} \ \prod_{1 \le j < k \le l^w_i} (t^{(i)}_j - t^{(i)}_k)^2 \ .$$

This Σ^w-invariant function is called *the master function associated with the basic situation and the permutation* $w \in \Sigma_{N+1}$.

Define the scheme $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}'_w$ as the subscheme in $\tilde{R}^o$ of critical points of the master function. The following is a generalization of Lemma 1.11 and is proved in an identical fashion.

Lemma 3.4. *The subschemes* $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_w$ *and* $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}'_w$ *of* $\tilde{R}^o$ *coincide.*

Let $(V, E_\bullet) \in \mathrm{Fl}^o_w$. Denote $\boldsymbol{y} = \Theta(V, E_\bullet) \in \mathcal{A}_w$. Pick a point $\boldsymbol{t} \in \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{y})$. Let C be the unique irreducible component of $\mathcal{A}_w$ containing $\boldsymbol{y}$ and $\tilde{C}$ the unique irreducible component of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_w$ containing $\boldsymbol{t}$. The following is a generalization of Theorem 1.12 with a similar proof.

Theorem 3.5. *The geometric multiplicity of the scheme* Ω *at* V *equals the geometric multiplicity of* $\tilde{C}$.

Example: Let $N = 1$, $n = 3$, $z_1 = 1$, $z_2 = \omega$, $z_3 = \omega^2$ where $\omega = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}$. Let $d = 3$, $\mathbf{a}(1) = \mathbf{a}(\omega) = \mathbf{a}(\omega^2) = \mathbf{a}(\infty) = (1, 0)$. Let w be the transposition (12) in Σ^2.

It is easy to see that $T_1(x) = x^3 - 1$, $l_1^w = 1$, and $\Phi(t) = T_1(t)^{-1}$. The critical scheme of Φ is $\{t \mid t^2 = 0\}$, namely $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[t]/(t^2))$. In other words, the master function has one critical point at $t = 0$ of multiplicity 2.

The polynomial y_1 associated to the critical point is the polynomial x. The equation $\mathrm{Wr}(y_1, \tilde{y_1}) = T_1$ has solutions $\tilde{y_1} = 1 + x^3/2 - cx$ with $c \in \mathbb{C}$. The associated two dimensional space of polynomials V is the $\mathbb{C}$-span of x and $x^3 + 2$. The ramification points of V are 1, ω, ω^2, ∞ with ramification sequences all equal to $(1, 0)$.

Counted with multiplicity there are two points of Ω. The associated cohomology product is the 4th power of the hyperplane class in $\mathrm{Gr}(2, 4)$ which is 2 points. It follows from Theorem 3.2 that Ω is set-theoretically exactly one point V counted with multiplicity 2.

It is easy to see that V admits a first order deformation in Ω. The deformation is given by the $\mathbb{C}$-span of $x + \epsilon$ and $x^3 + 2 - 3\epsilon\, x^2$ over $\mathbb{C}[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)$. Indeed we have

$$\mathrm{Wr}\left(x + \epsilon, -1 - \frac{x^3}{2} + \frac{3\epsilon\, x^2}{2}\right) = x^3 - 1 \mod \epsilon^2 .$$

4. Critical points of master functions

Let $l_1, \dots, l_N$ be nonnegative integers and $z_1, \dots, z_n$ distinct complex numbers. For $s = 1, \dots, n$, fix nonnegative integers $m_s(1), \dots, m_s(N)$. Define polynomials $T_1, \dots, T_N$ by the formula $T_i = \prod_{s=1}^{n} (x - z_s)^{m_s(i)}$. *The master function* Φ *associated to this data* is the rational function

$$\Phi(t_j^{(i)}) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{j=1}^{l_i} T_i(t_j^{(i)})^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^{l_i} \prod_{k=1}^{l_{i+1}} (t_j^{(i)} - t_k^{(i+1)})^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{1 \le j < k \le l_i} (t_j^{(i)} - t_k^{(i)})^2$$

of $l_1 + \dots + l_N$ variables $t_1^{(1)}, \dots, t_{l_1}^{(1)}, \dots, t_1^{(N)}, \dots, t_{l_N}^{(N)}$ considered on the set of points where

- The numbers $t_1^{(i)}, \dots, t_{l_i}^{(i)}$ are distinct;
- The sets $\{t_1^{(i)}, \dots, t_{l_i}^{(i)}\}$ and $\{t_1^{(i+1)}, \dots, t_{l_{i+1}}^{(i+1)}\}$ do not intersect;
- The sets $\{t_1^{(i)}, \dots, t_{l_i}^{(i)}\}$ and $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ do not intersect.

Let $l_0 = l_{N+1} = 0$. Define $c_i = i - 1 + l_i - l_{i-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \sum_{s=1}^{n} m_s(j)$ for $i = 1, \dots, N+1$.

Lemma 4.1. *If either* $c_i < 0$ *for some* $i = 1, \dots, N+1$ *or* $c_i = c_j$ *for some* $1 \le i < j \le N+1$, *then* Φ *has no critical points.*

Proof. Let $(t_j^{(i)})$ be a critical point of Φ. Set $y_i = \prod_{j=1}^{l_i} (x - t_j^{(i)})$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Then y_i divides $\mathrm{Wr}(y_i', T_i\, y_{i-1}\, y_{i+1})$, where as usual we set $y_{N+1} = y_0 = 1$.

We have $c_i \;=\; i-1 \,+\, \deg\, y_i \,-\, \deg\, y_{i-1} \,+\, \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \deg\, T_j$. By part (3) of Theorem 2.5, $c_1, \dots, c_{N+1}$ are pairwise distinct non-negative numbers. ☐

Assume $c_1, \dots, c_{N+1}$ are pairwise distinct nonnegative integers. Let $u \in \Sigma_{N+1}$ be the permutation such that $c_{u(1)} \,>\, c_{u(2)} \,>\, \dots \,>\, c_{u(N+1)}$. Let $d = \max\,\{c_1, \dots, c_{N+1}\}$.

For $z \in \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ define the ramification sequence $\mathbf{a}(z)$ by the rule

$$a_j(z) \;=\; \sum_{\ell=j}^{N} m_{N+1-\ell}(z)\;, \qquad j = 1, \dots, N+1\;.$$

Define the ramification sequence $\mathbf{a}(\infty)$ at ∞ by the rule

$$a_j(\infty) \;=\; d \;-\; (N+1) + j \;-\; c_{u(j)}\;, \qquad j = 1, \dots, N+1\;.$$

Proposition 4.2. *The master function* Φ *of this section is the same as the master function of the basic situation of Section 3 associated with the space* $W = \mathbb{C}_d[x]$*, ramification sequences* $\mathbf{a}(z_1)$, …, $\mathbf{a}(z_n)$, $\mathbf{a}(\infty)$*, and the permutation* u^{-1} *in* Σ_{N+1}. ☐

Appendix A.

A.1. **Equation** $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y,\,\tilde y) \,=\, T$.

Lemma A.1. *Let* A *be an algebra over* $\mathbb{C}$. *Let* $y, T \in A[x]$.

1. *If the equation* $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y, \tilde y) \,=\, T$ *has a solution* $\tilde y \in A[x]$ *then* y *divides* $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y', T)$.
2. *If the ideal* $(y, y') \,=\, A[x]$ *and* y *divides* $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y', T)$*, then the equation* $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y, \tilde y) \,=\, T$ *has a solution* $\tilde y \in A[x]$.

Proof. If $T \,=\, \mathrm{Wr}(\,y, \tilde y)$, then $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y', \mathrm{Wr}(\,y, \tilde y)) \,=\, y''\,(y'\tilde y \,-\, y\,\tilde y') \,-\, y'\,(y''\,\tilde y \,-\, y\,\tilde y'') \,=\, y\,(y'\,\tilde y'' \,-\, y''\,\tilde y')$, and y divides $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y', T)$.

For the other direction, write $T \,=\, ay + by'$ for suitable polynomials a, b. Then $T = (a+b')\,y \,+\, \mathrm{Wr}(\,y, b)$. We have $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y', T) = \mathrm{Wr}(\,y', y(a+b')) + \mathrm{Wr}(\,y', \mathrm{Wr}(\,y, b))$. The last term is divisible by y. If y divides $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y', T)$, then y divides $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y',\, y\,(a+b'))$. This implies that y divides $(y')^2(a+b')$. Writing $c\,y' \,=\, 1 \,-\, dy$ for suitable polynomials c and d, we deduce that y divides $(a+b')$. Thus, $y(a+b') \,=\, y^2 e$ for a suitable polynomial e. Let f be a polynomial whose derivative is $-e$. Then $\mathrm{Wr}(\,1, f) \,=\, e$, and $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y, yf) \,=\, y(a+b')$. Finally, $\mathrm{Wr}(\,y, yf+b) = y(a+b') + \mathrm{Wr}(\,y, b) = T$. ☐

Lemma A.2. *Suppose* $y, f \in A[x]$ *and* y *is monic.*

1. *There exist unique* $q, r \in A[x]$ *such that* $f \,=\, y\,q \,+\, r$ *and* $\deg\, r \,<\, \deg\, y$.
2. *Suppose that* $y \,=\, \prod_{j=1}^{m}(x - t_j), t_j \in A$ *and* $t_j - t_k$ *are units in* A *for* $j \neq k$. *Then the ideal in* A *generated by coefficients of the polynomial* r *in (1), coincides with the ideal in* A *generated by* $f(t_1), \dots, f(t_m)$.

Proof. Existence and uniqueness of q and r follows from the monicity of y and long division.

For the second part, write $f(t_j) = r_{m-1}t_j^{m-1} + \ldots + r_0$. From Cramer's rule and the formula for the Vandermonde determinant we deduce that the coefficients of r lie in the ideal generated by $f(t_1), \ldots, f(t_m)$. ☐

Lemma A.3. *Let $(A, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local ring and $y_1, y_2 \in A[x]$ with y_1 monic. Suppose that the ideal generated by the reductions $(\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2) = (A/\mathfrak{m})[x]$. Then the ideal $(y_1,\, y_2)$ equals $A[x]$.*

Proof. The A-module $A[x]/(y_1)$ is a finite A-module because y_1 is monic. The quotient $M = A[x]/(y_1, y_2)$ of $A[x]$ by the ideal (y_1, y_2) is therefore a finite A-module. Now, $M \otimes A/\mathfrak{m} = (A/\mathfrak{m})[x] \,/\, (\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2) = 0$ by hypothesis. By Nakayama's Lemma ([M], Theorem 4.8), we conclude that $M = 0$. ☐

Lemma A.4. *Let A be an algebra, $y = \prod_{j=1}^{m}(x - t_j) \in A[x]$ with $t_j \in A$ and $T = \prod_{l=1}^{n}(x - z_l) \in A[x]$ with $z_l \in A$. Then*

1. *The ideal $(y,\, y') = A[x]$ if and only if $t_i - t_j$ are units in A for all $i < j$.*
2. *The ideal $(T,\, y) = A[x]$ if and only if $t_j - z_l$ are units in A for all j, l.*
3. *Assume that the ideals $(y,\, y') = A[x]$ and $(T,\, y) = A[x]$. Then, y divides $\mathrm{Wr}(\, y', T)$ if and only if the following system of equations holds:*

$$\sum_{l \in \{1,\ldots,m\} - j} \frac{2}{t_j - t_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{n} \frac{1}{t_j - z_l} = 0\,, \qquad j = 1, \ldots, m\,. \tag{A.1}$$

Notice that the system of equations (A.1) coincides with the critical point equations for the function

$$\Phi(t_1, \ldots, t_m) = \prod_{1 \le i < j \le m} (t_i - t_j)^2 \prod_{j=1}^{m} \prod_{l=1}^{n} (t_j - z_l)^{-1} = \prod_{1 \le i < j \le m} (t_i - t_j)^2 \prod_{j=1}^{n} T(t_j)^{-1}$$

of variables $t_1, \ldots, t_m$.

Proof. If the ideal $(y, y') = A[x]$, write $1 = ay + by'$ and substitute $x = t_i$ to conclude that $t_i - t_j$ is invertible for $i \neq j$.

For the other direction, let $M = A[x]/(y, y')$. Clearly, $M/\mathfrak{m}M = (A/\mathfrak{m})[x]/(\bar{y}, \bar{y'}) = 0$, which is guaranteed by the assumption and the standard theory of fields. Since y is monic, by Lemma A.3, $M = 0$. The assertion (2) is proved similarly.

It is easy to see that (3) follows from Lemma A.2 and Lemma A.1. ☐

Lemma A.5. *For $y_1, y_2, T \in A[x]$, assume that the ideal $(y_1,\, y_2) = A[x]$ and y_1 divides $y_2 T$. Then y_1 divides T.*

Proof. Write $1 = ay_1 + by_2$. Hence $T = aTy_1 + bTy_2$. The last two terms are divisible by y_1. Hence y_1 divides T. ☐

A.2. **Proof of Lemma 2.2.** The implication (1) ⇒ (3) is immediate.

If (2) holds , then V is finitely generated module which is a direct summand of a free module. This implies that it is free (being a direct summand implies that it is projective and projective modules over local rings are free). The morphism $V \otimes A/\mathfrak{m} \to \mathbb{C}[x]$ is a direct summand of the isomorphism $A[x] \otimes A/\mathfrak{m} \to \mathbb{C}[x]$ and hence is injective. This gives (1).

We prove (1) and (2) assuming (3). Pick a large integer d so that $V \subset A_d[x]$. By assumption we can find $v_1, \dots, v_{d+1-k} \in A_d[x]$ such that the collection $\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_k$, $\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_{d+1-k}$ form a basis for the $\mathbb{C}$-vector space $\mathbb{C}_d[x]$. This implies that the change of basis matrix from the standard basis of $A_d[x]$ to $u_1, \dots, u_k, v_1, \dots, v_{d+1-k}$ has the determinant that does not vanish upon reduction to the residue field. Therefore, the determinant is a unit in A. Hence $u_1, \dots, u_k, v_1, \dots, v_{d+1-k}$ form a free basis in $A_d[x]$. This proves (1) and (2), where for (2) we let $M = \operatorname{span}_A(v_1, \dots, v_{d+1-k}) \oplus x^{d+1}A[x] \subset A[x]$.

A.3. **Multiplicity.** We will recall the algebro-geometric definitions of multiplicity from [F], Section 1.5. In this section we will need to consider local rings whose residue field may be different from $\mathbb{C}$.

Let X be an irreducible algebraic scheme. The geometric multiplicity of X, denoted by $m(X)$, is the length of the local ring of X at its generic point. Explicitly, if Spec(A) is an affine open subset of X, then A has exactly one minimal prime ideal. Denote it by $\mathfrak{p}$. The localisation $A_\mathfrak{p}$ is an Artin ring and is therefore of finite length. The integer $m(X)$ is the length of $A_\mathfrak{p}$. A more practical way of computing $m(X)$ is obtained from Proposition A.7.

Example: Consider the geometric multiplicity of the "doubled line" Spec$(\mathbb{C}[x,y]/(x^2))$. This has exactly one minimal prime ideal, namely (x). The localisation at this minimal prime ideal is the ring $\mathbb{C}(y)[x]/(x^2)$, which is of length 2.

Now, we will discuss properties of geometric multiplicity, linking it to "multiplicity in the transversal direction". The first property is (see [F], Example A.1.1):

Proposition A.6. *If X is an irreducible 0-dimensional scheme (i.e a fat point), then $m(X)$ is the dimension over $\mathbb{C}$ of the ring of functions of X,*

$$m(X) \ = \ \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \ .$$

In general, if X is an irreducible scheme, then X is reduced if and only if its geometric multiplicity is 1.

The following proposition follows from Lemma 1.7.2 in [F].

Proposition A.7. *Suppose that X is an irreducible subscheme of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let X_{red} be the reduced subscheme corresponding to X. The subscheme X_{red} can be considered to be a closed subscheme of X. Let U be the smooth locus of X_{red}. Let H be a hyperplane in $\mathbb{C}^n$ which meets U transversally at a point $x \in U$. Let D be the irreducible component of $X \cap H$ which contains x (there is exactly one such irreducible component). Then,*

$$m(X) \ = \ m(D) \ .$$

Iterating this procedure, we obtain the following statement. Suppose T is a plane in $\mathbb{C}^n$ of dimension complementary to dim X*, which meets U transversally at a point $x \in U$ (there could be other points of intersection). Then, the multiplicity of X equals to the dimension over $\mathbb{C}$ of the localization at x of the algebra of functions on the scheme $X \cap H$.*

There is one other standard property of multiplicity that we will need. Recall that a smooth morphism between schemes is a flat morphism with smooth fibers.

Proposition A.8. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a smooth morphism between irreducible schemes. Then, $m(X) = m(Y)$.*

Proof. We will use the notations and definitions of [F]. Let $X_{\rm red}$ and $Y_{\rm red}$ be the reduced schemes underlying X and Y. Then by definition $[X] = m(X)[X_{\rm red}]$ and $[Y] = m(Y)[Y_{\rm red}]$. The smoothness of f tells us that $f^{-1}(Y_{\rm red})$ is reduced and hence $f^{-1}(Y_{\rm red}) = X_{\rm red}$. Clearly $f^{-1}(Y) = X$. Apply Lemma 1.7.1 in [F] to see that $f^*[Y] = [f^{-1}(Y)]$. This gives $m(Y)[X_{\rm red}] = m(X)[X_{\rm red}]$ and therefore $m(X) = m(Y)$. $\square$

A.4. **Multiplicity in intersection theory.** Irreducible subvarieties $X_1, \dots, X_r$ of a smooth variety X are said to intersect properly, provided each irreducible component of $X_1 \cap \dots \cap X_r$ is of dimension $\dim X - \sum_{j=1}^r (\dim X - \dim X_j)$. We will use the following basic result.

Denote the smooth locus of X_i by X_i^o. Suppose that $X_1, \dots, X_r$ intersect properly in a finite set, that is, the expected dimension of the intersection is 0. Suppose that

$$X_1 \cap \dots \cap X_r = X_1^o \cap \dots \cap X_r^o .$$

Then we have an equality of cohomology classes in $H^*(X)$,

$$\prod_{i=1}^r [X_i] = c\, [\mathrm{pt}] ,$$

where c is the sum of the multiplicities of the irreducible components of the scheme theoretic intersection $X_1 \cap \dots \cap X_r$ and [pt] the class of a point.

This statement follows from [F], Proposition 7.1.

A.5. **Standard results in the theory of schemes.** For a scheme X and a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra A, we let

$$X(A) = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{Spec}(A), X) .$$

If A is a local ring, and $s \in X(A)$, then we denote the induced point in $X(\mathbb{C}) = X(A/\mathfrak{m})$ by $\bar{s}$. If $x \in X(A/\mathfrak{m})$ is given, we let $X_x(A) = \{s \in X(A) \mid \bar{s} = x\}$. For $s \in X_x(A)$ there corresponds a local homomorphism of local rings $\mathcal{O}_{X,x} \to A$, where $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is the local ring of X at x.

Lemma A.9. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a finite morphism of schemes. Then, f is a closed immersion if and only if for every local ring A, the induced mapping $X(A) \to Y(A)$ is injective.*

Proof. If $f : X \to Y$ makes X a subscheme of Y, then clearly $X(A) \to Y(A)$ is injective.

To go the other way, let $x \in X$ and $y = f(x)$. By taking $A = \mathbb{C}$, we see that $f^{-1}(y)$ is the singleton $\{x\}$. Denote the local ring of X at x by $(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}, m_x)$ and that of Y at y by $(\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}, m_y)$.

Now let $A = \mathbb{C}[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2)$. Consider the induced mapping $X_x(A) \to Y_y(A)$. This is once again injective by hypothesis. It is a basic fact that $X_x(A) = \mathrm{Hom}(m_x/m_x^2, \mathbb{C})$ and $Y_y(A) = \mathrm{Hom}(m_y/m_y^2, \mathbb{C})$. Therefore the hypothesis implies that $\mathrm{Hom}(m_x/m_x^2, \mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{Hom}(m_y/m_y^2, \mathbb{C})$ is injective or that the natural morphism $m_y/m_y^2 \to m_x/m_x^2$ is surjective. By [H], II.7.4, we conclude that the map $\mathcal{O}_{Y,y} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is surjective. This shows that $X \to Y$ is a closed inclusion. □

Lemma A.10. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a closed immersion of schemes. Then f is an isomorphism if and only if $f : X(A) \to Y(A)$ is surjective for every local ring A.*

Proof. If f is an isomorphism, then $X(A) \to Y(A)$ is clearly bijective for any local ring A.

To go the other way, let $x \in X$ and $y = f(x)$. Denote the local ring of X at x by $(\mathcal{O}_{X,x}, m_x)$ and that of Y at y by $(\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}, m_y)$.

Suppose that y is in an open affine subset $\mathrm{Spec}(B) \subseteq Y$. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of $\mathrm{Spec}(B)$ corresponding to the point y. Then $\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}$ is the same as the localization B_m of B at m. The natural map $B \to B_m$ gives a point η in $\mathrm{Spec}(B)(\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}) \subseteq Y(\mathcal{O}_{Y,y})$. Clearly $\bar{\eta} = y$ and therefore $\eta \in Y_y(\mathcal{O}_{Y,y})$. The map of local rings corresponding to η is the identity map $\mathcal{O}_{Y,y} \to \mathcal{O}_{Y,y}$

By the given hypothesis, there exists $\theta \in X(\mathcal{O}_{Y,y})$ such that $f(\theta) = \eta$. The reduction of this point is $x \in X(\mathbb{C})$ because the reduction has to sit over $y \in Y(\mathbb{C})$.

Therefore we obtain a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{O}_{Y,y} \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[dr, "="] & \mathcal{O}_{X,x} \arrow[d, "\theta"] \\
& \mathcal{O}_{Y,y}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Hence $\mathcal{O}_{Y,y} \to \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is both injective and surjective whence an isomorphism. □

The following proposition is standard and follows from the description of Schubert varieties as degeneracy loci (cf. [F], chapter 14).

Proposition A.11. *Let A be a local ring and W a $\mathbb{C}$-vector space of rank $d+1$. Then, $\mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W)(A)$ is the set of free submodules $V \subset W \otimes A$ of rank $N+1$, such that $V \otimes A/\mathfrak{m} \to W$ is injective.*

The subset $\Omega^o_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathcal{F})(A) \subseteq \mathrm{Gr}(N+1, W)(A)$ consists of submodules V such that there exists an A-basis $u_1, \ldots, u_{d+1}$ of $W \otimes A$ with the following properties:

- *F_i is the A-span of $u_1, \ldots, u_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d+1$;*
- *V is the A-span of the elements $u_{d-N+j-a_j}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, N+1$.*

References

[B] P. Belkale. *Invariant theory of* GL(n) *and intersection theory of Grassmannians.* International Math Research Notices, 2004, no. 69, 3709–3721.

[EH] D. Eisenbud and J. Harris. *Limit linear series: basic theory.* Inventiones math. 85 (1986), 337–371.

[F] W. Fulton. *Intersection theory.* Springer-Verlag Berlin, second edition 1998.

[H] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics 52, Springer-Verlag, 1977.

[MV] E. Mukhin and A. Varchenko. *Critical points of master functions and flag varieties.* Communications in Contemporary Mathematics. Vol 6, No. 1(2004), 111–163.

[M] H. Matsumura. *Commutative ring theory.* Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics, 8, 1994.

[V] A. Varchenko. *Special functions, KZ type equations and Representation theory.* Conference board of the mathematical sciences (CBMS), regional conference series in mathematics, number 98, 2003.